provincial *equites* and *senatores* in their respective cities (25–30). Perhaps she should have stressed more the contrast between the Oriental and the Occidental parts of the Empire, since in the time of Augustus the Italic component of the Empire was emphasized. In ch. 3 she studies (33–8) the ethnic origin of the provincial *equites* and *senatores*, which confirms the ethnic diversity of the Roman Empire. The fourth chapter, in which she treats the material resources of the *equites* and *senatores* (41–8), is very important, because she highlights the fact that the élite provincial families did not only belong to the local aristocracy, but had to have money and be prepared to spend it for the benefit of the Empire. The fifth chapter deals with the careers of provincial *equites* and *senatores* in the time of Augustus (49–59), describing successful careers and pointing out that knowledge of the corresponding region played an important role in the promotion of *equites* (57); at the same time, she indicates that provinces like Egypt were ruled by non-Egyptians in order to avoid uprisings in the old kingdom of Cleopatra and Mark Anthony (59). The sixth chapter is concerned with the importance of patronage in the promotion of provincials in the time of Augustus (62–9). One observes that this phenomenon based on *clientela* and *amicitia* still survives in present Mediterranean societies. Finally, in the seventh chapter S. studies the role played by families and marriages (70–96); she stresses the importance of the family for a political career in the Roman world (70).

At the end, there is a summary (80–3) pointing out that Augustus made membership of the Senate hereditary, even for *homines novi*, which was not the case in the late Republic. However, in the time of Augustus few provincials were admitted as *equites* or *senatores*. The few 'new men' who acceded to these ranks came from the Romanized élites of Gallia Narbonensis, Baetica, or from Italic families settled in the provinces — incidentally, this shows the high degree of Romanization of the provinces — who were owners of *latifundia*. Provincials from the Roman East were, according to S., neither socially nor culturally orientated towards Rome, though there were exceptions. However, one could object that the families of the East did support Augustus' achievement, because it meant promotion for them. S. rightly concludes by saying that the promotion of provincials under Augustus was quite limited and that the real promotion began under Claudius. There are also useful tables concerning the essential points of the study (31–2, 39–40, 60–1, 77–9).

The remainder of the book is devoted to prosopography (84–150), with mention of the sources (literary and epigraphic), bibliography, and commentary for each person: for the twelve *senatores* (85–99), for the thirty *equites* (100–42), and an appendix for the two *procuratores* (143–5) and the seven officers (146–50) who did not belong to the equestrian order.

At the end of the book (151–66) there is a list of abbreviations and an up-to-date bibliography. The book concludes with a list of sources (167–73), of persons (174–7), and subjects (177–81).

This book by S. is of much interest for the study of social history in its interaction with the economy. She studies an essential issue as it was the purpose of Augustus to rule the Empire through the provincial élites. This is research mainly based on inscriptions and with the limits imposed by the epigraphic evidence. Nevertheless, S. has used every type of source very well. It is an excellent study but one in which it would have been worthwhile to have paid more attention to comparisons with the situation before Augustus.

Madrid J. M. ALONSO-NÚÑEZ

T. HAUKEN, *PETITION AND RESPONSE. AN EPIGRAPHIC STUDY OF PETITIONS TO ROMAN EMPERORS, 181–249* (Monographs from the Norwegian Institute at Athens 2). Bergen: The Norwegian Institute at Athens, 1998. Pp. xii + 383, 20 illus. ISBN 82–91626–08–1.

This volume contains the corpus of seven surviving petitions from subjects (*libelli*), complaining of abuses by soldiers and other officials, and the accompanying responses from emperors (*subscriptiones*; I, 1); nine petitions to lower officials and imperial responses without petitions (I, 2); and comparanda (III, 1). Two analytical chapters treat the petitions as texts (II, 1: rhetorical parts, themes, vocabulary) and the responses as evidence for Roman administration (II, 2: doubting without disproving Wilcken's contention that responses were communicated uniquely by being posted up). The documents have all been published before, and some are famous (Saltus Burunitanus, Scaptopara). W. Williams (esp. *JRS* 64 (1974), 86–103) and F. Millar, *The Emperor in the Roman World* (2nd edn., 1992), used many of them to explore government protocol, and P. Herrmann, in *Hilferufe aus römischen Provinzen: ein Aspekt der Krise des römischen Reiches im 3. Jhd. n. Chr.* (1990), cited them as evidence for the pre-Diocletianic government's inability to control its agents. Hauken's treatment is ample, with photos, critical text, and two commentaries (general and detailed) for each text, and even the Wolters-Wilamowitz-Mommsen correspondence on Scaptopara (134–7). H. competently makes the necessary comparisons with papyri (petitions to prefects of Egypt) and legal sources, especially the thematic collection of imperial rescripts from Hadrian onward in the *Codex Justinianus* (see now T. Honoré's chronological, or palingenetic, re-arrangement, available at http://iuscivile.com/materials/honore/rescripta/). At the very end of

Scaptopara, he proposes the appealing reading 'sig*na VI*[I]' ('[7] seals') — so copied and approved documents were then sealed, and our inscriptions are copies of these sealed copies (on the approval cf. J.-L. Mourgues, *MEFRA* 107 (1995), 255–300). Does not the disputed word *dare* (309–10) refer simply to the messenger who physically conveyed a text?

The originality of the volume lies in H.'s literary, or diplomatic, analysis of the petitions. For H. can demonstrate that the petitions have an astonishingly regular form, of *exordium, narratio,* and *preces,* with narratives consistently opening with the petitioner's status and provenance and closing with an expression of his inadequate resources. This regular form was recognized by both petitioners and emperors: petitioners employed technical terms of rhetoric (*enteuxis, diegesis, axiosis*) and engraved the inscriptions so as to reflect the rhetorical parts, and emperors also employed technical terms. Thus, in A.D. 238, Gordian III wrote to the Scaptoparans about 'this kind of complaint (*id genus quaerellae*) submitted in a petition (*preces*)', and counselled a soldier on handling a case where a verdict (*condemnatio*) had been inserted into a petition ('desideria (id est preces)'), potentially prejudicing the decision (*CJ* 2.9.2, cf. 259 n. 5; it is time for a full evaluation of the soldier's place in imperial law and politics, building on B. Campbell, *The Emperor and the Roman Army* (1984), 207–99). One is impressed by the thought that such a common rhetorical culture will have expedited proceedings, much as prescribed *formulae* had formerly expedited lay *iudicia,* and will have played a crucial part in unifying the Empire.

University of Neuchâtel GREG ROWE

M. CLAUSS, *KAISER UND GOTT: HERRSCHERKULT IM RÖMISCHEN REICH*. Stuttgart and Leipzig: Teubner, 1999. Pp. 597. ISBN 3-519-07444-3. DM 68.

In this study, Clauss argues that imperial cults helped redefine the meaning of the concept 'god' in the Roman Empire. His argument includes four major propositions. The first is that the emperors were gods and that imperial cults were religious institutions. This needs to be stated, according to C., because modern scholars usually employ Christianizing assumptions that generate misunderstandings of ancient religion. Careful examination of the data, however, shows that Greco-Roman religion was a matter of observance, not belief or emotion ('Handlung, nicht Haltung': 23), and that 'gods' were defined as beings that received cult (20). The second proposition is that emperors were worshipped as deities during their lifetimes throughout the Empire. In support of this proposition, C. provides a long historical survey (comprising a third of the book) that gathers the evidence for each ruler from Caesar to Theodosius I. The historical survey allows C. to develop a third proposition — that imperial cults gradually changed the way people understood the concept 'god'. As imperial cults spread throughout the Empire, the emperor eclipsed all other deities except Jupiter and so the concept 'god' took on new meanings. The fourth proposition comes as a surprise. In the last four pages of the book, C. declares that the understanding of 'god' that grew out of Roman imperial cults provided the model for orthodox Christology: Christ — like the emperor — was thought to have a human nature and a divine nature in one person.

The theoretical question raised by C. regarding ancient religion and the worship of rulers is important, but his solution is tangential to recent discussions because he has not availed himself of much recent secondary literature. It is probably impossible to master all the literature on such a large topic (29–30), but C. does not even engage in a discussion of the proposals made in S. Price's landmark study *Rituals and Power* (1984). C. chooses instead to cite and to argue with older works by G. Bowersock and A. D. Nock. Another problem is that C.'s method is not completely consistent with his theory: he begins by defining ancient religion in terms of ritual practice, but then develops his argument in terms of intellectual concepts. Furthermore, C.'s general theory of religion was more convincing in the early twentieth century. Finally, the proposal about the origins of Christology is underdeveloped and not well-integrated into the overall argument.

Along the way, however, there are several important discussions, including: the widespread worship of living emperors in the Western Empire; the overlapping usages of *deus* and *divus* (23–6, 356–7); the difficulty of distinguishing 'pagan' and 'Christian' (424–49, with special attention given to the sacrificial obligations of Christians in the Roman army); and the continuing practice of imperial cults well into the Byzantine period (198–215). The seven appendices and eight indices also make the book useful as a reference work. Specialists working on materials from the Western Empire will want to compare C.'s discussions with those of D. Fishwick, with whom C. frequently disagrees.

University of Missouri-Columbia STEVEN J. FRIESEN